

REMARKS

The present communication is responsive to the Official Action mailed September 28, 2007. A petition for a one-month extension of the term for response to said Official Action, to and including January 28, 2008, is transmitted herewith.

Initially, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) because they fail to show a locking disc shaped like a disc and a disc shaped-holder shaped like a disc and a laterally moveable relationship between the two components as described in the specification. First, Applicant has amended the specification, replacing reference to "locking disc" with "locking element" and changing "disc-shaped holder" to "holder." Accordingly, because there is no reference to a disc-shaped component in the specification, Applicant respectfully submits that failure to show a disc shape in the drawings does not support an objection under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Furthermore, Applicant has cancelled claims 5-6, drawn to a locking mechanism that includes a locking disc and a disc-shaped holder. 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) states that "[t]he drawing in a nonprovisional application must show every feature of the invention *specified in the claims.*" (emphasis added). Therefore, because the locking disc and the disc-shaped holder are no longer specified in the claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) has been overcome.

The Examiner then rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as his invention. Specifically, the Examiner asserted that "the locking arms" in claim 1, line 8 has no definite antecedent basis; "the first release mechanisms" in claim 2, line 3 has no definite antecedent basis; and claims 3 through 6 are

indefinite in that they depend from an indefinite base claim. Applicant has amended claim 1, replacing "the locking arms" with "at least one supporting arm," and claim 2, replacing "the first release mechanisms" with "the first release mechanism." Applicant has cancelled claims 5-6 and asserts that claims 3-4 depend from definite claim 1. In addition, Applicant has made further amendments to the claims to conform the claims to U.S. practice. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections, based on 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, have been overcome.

Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. As discussed above, claims 5 and 6 have been cancelled from this application. Applicant therefor respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections, based on 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1, have been overcome.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

Application No.: 10/500,755

Docket No.: ALBIHN W 3.3-453

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: January 28, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Taylor P. Evans  
Taylor P. Evans

Registration No.: 60,506

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

834484\_1.DOC